

## REMARKS

Claims 10 to 21 are retained unamended and claims 1 to 9, which were non-elected, have been canceled.

Claims 10 to 13 and 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zekeriya et al. (U.S. 6,607,962) in view of Chan or Ohkawa. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

To begin with, Ohkawa is not available as a reference in view of the Declaration attached hereto.

Claim 10 requires, in addition to other steps, the steps of forming a layer of titanium (Ti) over the first and second TFR vias, and forming a layer of titanium nitride (TiN) on the Ti layer, the layer of Ti and the layer of TiN forming a first electrical interface portion to the first end of the TFR and a second electrical interface portion to the second end of the TFR. No such steps are taught or even remotely suggested by Zekeriya et al. as admitted. With reference to Chan, the Ti/TiN is not stated at col. 3, lines 42 to 45 to be separate layers. In fact, by stating “[a]lso, both Ti/TiN and Ti/WN resistive layer are able to withstand high temperature backed processes”, the use of the term “layer” means a single layer, this meaning a combination of Ti and TiN. Furthermore, this argument is bolstered by the fact that the use of Ti/TiN is for the purpose of withstanding heat, this having nothing to do with the resistance problem solved by the layer of Ti followed by the layer of TiN. With reference to Chan at col. 4, lines 62 to 65, though two separate layers of Ti and TiN are discussed, note that the via is not over the end of the TFR, but rather to the side of the TFR. It follows that not only is the two layer structure of Chan not for the same purpose as in the subject invention, but,

in addition, there can be no suggestion to combine the references since the Ti/TiN layers of Chan are not disposed over the end of the TFR. It further follows that the suggestion to combine the references is taken from the subject disclosure and not from the prior art.

Claims 11 to 13 and 16 to 18 depend from claim 10 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 10.

Claims 14, 15 and 19 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zekeriya et al. in view of Chan or Ohkawa further in view of Lammert (U.S. 6,475,400). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims require the steps discussed above with reference to claim 10. Lammert in no way overcomes this deficiency.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(972) 917-4418 (Fax)